

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 WILLIAM J. GRADFORD,  
12 Plaintiff,  
13 v.  
14 F. VELASCO, et al.,  
15 Defendants.  
16

No. 1:20-cv-00543-NONE-EPG (PC)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS

(Doc. Nos. 50)

17  
18 Plaintiff William J. Gradford is a former pretrial detainee proceeding *pro se* and *in forma*  
19 *pauperis* in this civil-rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to  
20 a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

21 On April 16, 2021, plaintiff filed a motion to voluntarily dismiss this case and all other  
22 pending cases he had brought. (Doc. No. 42.) On April 19, 2021, plaintiff filed a motion for an  
23 order, requesting “effect order notice electronic filing.” (Doc. No. 45.) Then, on April 28, 2021,  
24 plaintiff filed a motion to withdraw his motion to dismiss. (Doc. No. 49.) On April 30, 2021, the  
25 assigned magistrate judge entered findings and recommendations, recommending that plaintiff’s  
26 motion to withdraw his motion to dismiss (Doc. No. 49) be granted and that plaintiff’s motion to  
27 dismiss this action and all other pending cases (Doc. No 42) and motion for order (Doc. No. 45)  
28 both be denied. (Doc. No. 50.)

1 Those findings and recommendations were served on the parties and contained notice that  
2 any objections thereto were to be filed within twenty-one (21) days after service. (*Id.* at 6.) On  
3 May 17, 2021, plaintiff filed a document entitled “objection to magistrate judge findings and  
4 recommendations (Doc. No. 50.)” (Doc. No. 63.) However, plaintiff did not actually list any  
5 objections in the body of the filing.

6 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, this  
7 court has conducted a *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the  
8 court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and proper analysis.

9 Accordingly,

- 10 1. The findings and recommendations issued by the magistrate judge on April 30,  
11 2021, (Doc. No. 50), are ADOPTED IN FULL;
- 12 2. Plaintiff’s motion to withdraw his motion to dismiss this action and all other  
13 pending actions, (Doc. No. 49), is GRANTED;
- 14 3. Plaintiff’s motion to dismiss, (Doc. No. 42), is DENIED; and
- 15 4. Plaintiff’s motion for order, (Doc. No. 45), is DENIED.

16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17 Dated: June 2, 2021

18   
19 \_\_\_\_\_  
20 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28